



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JUSTICE, FREEDOM AND SECURITY

Directorate B
Unit B/4: Financial support - Immigration and Asylum

SOLID/2009/37

**Committee
General programme
Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows**

Subject: Template for the intermediate report for the **European Fund for the integration of third-country nationals**

Summary

According to Article 48(2), point (a) of Council Decision 2007/435/EC, Member States shall submit by 30 June 2010 an evaluation report on the implementation of actions co-financed by the Fund. On the basis of the reports from the Member States, the Commission shall submit to the EP, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the regions, by 31 December 2010 an intermediate report on the results achieved and qualitative and quantitative aspects of implementation of the Fund.

A draft template for the report to be submitted by Member States was presented at the conference of 22 and 23 September 2009. Following feedback from Member States and a presentation at the SOLID Committee of 16 November 2009, please find enclosed the final version of the template. The template for the intermediate report for the European Fund for the integration of third-country nationals is made up of only this document (here in Word format).

Action to be taken

Preparation of the report on the basis of the template.

The report should be sent to JLS-SOLID-COMMITTEE@ec.europa.eu by **30 June 2010**.

For any question on how to fill in this template please contact the desk officer in charge of your national programme in Unit JLS-B-4.

Template for preparation by Member States of the

**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS
CO FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF
THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS**

(Report set out in Article **48, 2 (a)** of Council Decision **2007/435/EC**)

*Please fill in the enclosed template
(preferably in English, French or German)
and submit it to the Commission no later than 30 June 2010*

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. *The enclosed template is intended to assist Member States in the preparation of the evaluation report which they have to submit to the Commission no later than 30 June 2010, as set out in Article 48, 2 (a) of Council Decision 2007/435/EC.*

Please always use this format, as this is the only way to provide for a homogeneous evaluation across all member States and for the Community wide evaluation subsequently.

You are free to add any further document you think can be useful in the context of this evaluation. If so, enclose them as an annex, but not as part of this template.

2. *When filling in this template please be as concrete as possible, providing facts, examples, figures, etc. - It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF , but not necessarily familiar with the national programme concerned. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities.*
3. *A maximum length of description is indicated for many items. As far as possible this limit should be respected.*
4. *When your opinion is asked for, please explain the reasons on which it is based.*
5. *As the content of this mid term evaluation report is on implementation it is not required to have recourse to evaluation expertise: the report can be prepared by the Responsible Authority itself. However, for your convenience, you may choose to have recourse to evaluation expertise.*

In any case please fill in first the questionnaire on page 5 of the template.

Whether you had recourse to evaluation expertise or not, the evaluation report must always be signed by the Responsible Authority. The Responsible Authority remains responsible for its content.

**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS
CO FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF
THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS**

(Report set out in Article 48, 2 (a) of Council Decision 2007/435/EC)

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of: (Member State)
Malta

Date:
30 July 2010

Name, Signature (authorised representative of the Responsible Authority):
Christopher Magri
Acting Head of the National Authority

Name of the contact person (and contact details) for this report in the Member State
Christopher Magri
Acting Head of the National Authority
Ministry of Education, Employment and the Family
Palazzo Ferreria
310, Republic Street,
Valletta VLT 2000
Tel: 25903107
Fax: 25903111

GENERAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON EVALUATION EXPERTISE AND ON METHODOLOGY

1. Did you have recourse to an evaluation expertise to prepare this report?

Yes/ No: No

- If *Yes*, for what part(s) of this report? N/A

- Please explain what kind of evaluation expertise you had recourse to:

* In-house evaluation expertise (for instance, Evaluation department of the Ministry, etc.): (please describe)

N/A

* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

N/A

2. Brief description of the methodology used by the evaluation expertise:

N/A

Important remark

Any evaluation expertise must be obliged by the Responsible Authority to:

- use this template, exclusively;
- fully comply with any instruction, methodological note, maximum length, etc. set out in this template.

EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS CO-FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS

CONTENTS

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
3. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD, 2007 THROUGH 2009
4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY
5. BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
6. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
7. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009

**Part I: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD**

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *Your Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of actions;*
- *All information on implementation available to the Responsible Authority;*
- *The information on the projects funded available to the Responsible Authority (description of each project to be found in the grant agreement);*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available.*

Did you implement any of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “awarding body” method (as defined in Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programme(s)?

Yes/No: Yes

- If *Yes*, fill in Part I, pages 8 to 13.
- If *No*, do not fill in Part I, but go directly to Part II (Implementation of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “executing body” method) on page 14.

I.1 - Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the “awarding body” method from 2007 to 2009

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, enter the share of the overall EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) which was granted in the “awarding body” method (in percentage, no decimal).

- Programme 2007: 0% *

* *No EIF has been committed under the 2007 annual programme.*

- Programme 2008: 100% (awarding body method)

- Programme 2009: 100% (awarding body method)

I.2 - Calls for proposals

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number of calls for proposals organised for the implementation of the annual EIF programmes in the “awarding body” method.

- Programme 2007: (1)

- Programme 2008: (1)

- Programme 2009: (2)

I.3 - Proposals received, selected and funded after calls for proposals

Definitions:

- If more than one call for proposals was organised for a given annual programme, provide in the table below, for that programme, figures combining all of that programme's calls.

- Project funded = a contract, a grant agreement or any equivalent form of legal instrument has been signed with the beneficiary

- If multiannual projects have been funded, they should be counted only in the first programme year they were received, selected and funded

Definition of a multiannual project: According to the legal basis, the end of the eligibility period for projects under the 2007 Programme is 31st December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30th June 2010 and 30th June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for EIF funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the annual programme under which it was selected and funded.

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	9	1	4	14
Projects selected	0	1	3	4
Projects funded	0	1	3	4

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for proposals been funded?

Yes/No: No

- If *No*, explain why: Proposal for the 2008 programme is expected to be funded by the third quarter of 2010, while the 2009 programme is being contracted.

I.4 - Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals

In duly justified cases, grants may be awarded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals (Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules -, third paragraph).

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for proposals should not be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Please indicate the number of projects funded (*see definition on page 8*) in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals.

Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

I.5 - Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method in the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table I.3)	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>

I.6 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

By Priority

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Priority: each of the four Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Priorities)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	0	1	3
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	0	1	1
Priority 2	0	0	0
Priority 3	0	0	1
Priority 4	0	0	1

I.7 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

By Category of Actions

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Category of Actions: each of the four Categories, from a) to d), set out in Article 3 of the EIF Council decision (Decision 2007/435/EC)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Categories)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	0	1	3
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	0	1	2
Category b)	0	0	0
Category c)	0	0	0
Category d)	0	0	1

I.8 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

Specific Priorities

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- *Specific Priorities: the five Specific Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)*
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two of the headings listed below)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	0	1	3
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	0	0	0
Specific Priority 2 only	0	0	0
Specific Priority 3 only	0	0	0
Specific Priority 4 only	0	0	0
Specific Priority 5 only	0	0	0
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	0	1	3
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	0	0	0

Part II of the interim report covering pages 15 to 21 are not applicable

**Part II: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD**

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *Your Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of Actions*
- *All information on implementation available to the Responsible Authority*
- *The information on the projects funded available to the Responsible Authority (description of each project to be found in the grant agreement)*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available*

Did you implement any of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “executing body” method (as defined in Article 8 of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programme(s)?

Yes/No: No

- If *Yes*, fill in Part II, pages 15 to 20.
- If *No*, do not fill in Part II, but go directly to Part III (Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method and in the “executing body” method, 2007 through 2009) on page 21.

II.1 - Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the “executing body” method from 2007 to 2009

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, enter the share of the overall EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) which was granted in the “executing body” method (in percentage, no decimal).

- Programme 2007: ... % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: ... %
- Programme 2009: ... %

II.2 - Calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar organised for the implementation of the yearly EIF programmes in the “executing body” method

- Programme 2007: (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

II.3 - Proposals received, selected and funded after calls for expression of interest, calls for proposals, consultation with potential beneficiaries or similar selection method in the “executing body” method

Definitions:

- If more than one call for expression of interest, call for proposals or similar was organised for a given annual programme, provide in the table below, for that annual programme, figures combining all of that programme’s calls.

- Project funded = a contract, a grant agreement or any equivalent form of legal instrument has been signed with the beneficiary

- If multiannual projects have been funded, they should be counted only in the first programme year they were received, selected and funded

Definition of a multiannual project: According to the legal basis, the end of the eligibility period for projects under the 2007 Programme is 31st December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30th June 2010 and 30th June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for EIF funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the annual programme under which it was selected and funded.

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009
Proposals received				
Projects selected				
Projects funded				

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for expression of interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method been funded?

Yes/No:

- If No, explain why:

II.4 - Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar

Please indicate the number of projects funded (see definition on page 15) in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals, or similar selection method, e.g. direct negotiation.

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call should not be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest/ for proposals/ similar selection method	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number				

II.5 - Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method in the programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>Total Prog. 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method (see table II.3)				
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)				
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method				

II.6 - Distribution of projects funded in the “executing body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

By Priority

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Priority: each of the four Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Priorities)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →			
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1			
Priority 2			
Priority 3			
Priority 4			

II.7 - Distribution of projects funded in the “executing body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

By Category of Actions

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Category of Actions: each of the four Categories, from a) to d), set out in Article 3 of the EIF Council decision (Decision 2007/435/EC)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Categories)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →			
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)			
Category b)			
Category c)			
Category d)			

II.8 - Distribution of projects funded in the “executing body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009

Specific Priorities

- Only for projects funded, only *number* of projects in each case
- *Specific Priorities: the five Specific Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)*
- *No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two headings listed below)*

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →			
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only			
Specific Priority 2 only			
Specific Priority 3 only			
Specific Priority 4 only			
Specific Priority 5 only			
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities			
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority			

**Part III: SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED
IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND
IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
2007 THROUGH 2009**

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *The information on the projects funded available to the Responsible Authority (description of each project to be found in the grant agreement);*
- *All information on implementation available to the Responsible Authority;*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available.*

Explanations for this part:

Please provide a summary description of the projects funded (see definition on page 8) under your annual programmes 2007 through 2009, broken down by Priority as set out on the next pages. Under each Priority describe separately projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand.

In addition please describe separately (as set out below) projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals and projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, for proposals, or similar .

No breakdown per year is required in the items 1 to 6.

Referring to Tables I-6, I-7 and I-8 as well as II-6, II-7 and II-8 above, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009. In this context describe separately any change to the distribution for projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and for projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand.

In addition , highlight any other significant change to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and to projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand over the period from 2007 to 2009 (other than their distribution).

(Explanations continue on the next page)

It is not required to make a full description of all projects. What is needed is a concise, but very concrete description of the types of operations implemented under each Priority. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme. A list of projects is not an adequate description.

Technical assistance measures and publicity measures are covered by another part of the template and should not be described here.

Finally, you will be asked to describe two “success stories” and one “failure”, among all projects funded from 2007 to 2009.

For each item the maximum length is mentioned below the item’s description.

III.1. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 1 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Awarded in 2008

Name of Beneficiary : Memo

Title of project :SOLID “Solidarity lifts Social and Econimcal development”

The main objective of this project is Priority 1. Consequently, one of the objectives of the project is to provide a model promoting developments in integration policies brought forward by the European Union towards third countries.

This project links Priority 1 with Priority 2 by carrying out a comparative analysis of the Maltese legislation and other policy documents relating to the dialogue between the EU and third countries. Furthermore the project also addresses issue in relation to access to labour market, anti-discrimination laws, public opinion and political participation.

Awarded in 2009

Name of Beneficiary : University of Malta

Title of project: TCNs “The integration of Third Country Nationals in Europe”

The project seeks to influence policy makers in establishing a legal framework and a conscious policy that gets TCNs involved and contributes to society.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Not applicable

III.2. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 2 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Not applicable

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Not applicable

III.3. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 3 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Awarded in 2009

Name of Beneficiary : Inizjamed:

Title of project: Third Country National Mediation & Integration Project

The project aims to facilitate integration and community cohesion by recruiting and training volunteer community mediators from all sectors of society who will volunteer side by side with Maltese nationals. The project shall also train staff and provide advice to entities working in the field of integration so that they are in a better position to proffer a better service.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Not applicable

III.4. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 4 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Awarded in 2009

Name of Beneficiary: Fondazzjoni Temi Zammit

Title of the project: WELCOME “Working towards Migrants Integratio Through exchange mutual learning & common modules at EU levels”

The overall objective of the WELCOME project is to promote mutual learning by creating meaningful networks, redefining technological means such as social networking tools into powerful enablers of dialogue and exchange at a local level. It is also intended to support transnational awareness-raising campaigns and to promote the use of state-of-the art technologies. The project also includes design, development and implementation of pilot e-learning projects intended to facilitate practices of involvement of the host society and the immigrants' participation in the integration processes. The partners will set up an e-learning platform and will create specific modules incorporating new methods for language training specially adapted for immigrants from diverse cultural backgrounds, supplemented by courses dealing with practical issues such as legal requirements, schooling, health and institutions.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Not applicable

III.5. Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Maximum length: 15 lines

Please refer to Table I.4., excluding the continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for proposals. Technical Assistance measures should not be taken into account, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Not applicable

III.6. Summary description of the projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Maximum length: 15 lines

Please refer to Table II.4., excluding the continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar. Technical Assistance measures should not be taken into account, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Not applicable

III.7. Referring to Tables I-6, I-7 and I-8, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009

Maximum length: half a page

As already demonstrated above only four projects were awarded. One project was funded in 2008 and three were projects funded in 2009. No projects were awarded in 2007. The limited number of funded projects in Malta does not allow to conclusively draw any significant changes.

III.8. Referring to Tables II-6, II-7 and II-8, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “executing body” method, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009

Maximum length: half a page

Not applicable

III.9. Highlight any other significant change (other than the distribution referred to under points 7 and 8) to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method and in the “executing body” method over the period from 2007 to 2009

Maximum length: half a page

In the “awarding body” method

For the period under review, there are no major changes with regards to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method.

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

III.10. Description of two “success stories”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009

Please describe two projects (preferably under two different Priorities) which, in your opinion, deserve particular attention since you consider them as e.g. of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and your national requirement, or innovative, or a good practice, of interest for other Member States, etc. It is up to you to judge what projects deserve particular attention.

It is necessary to provide a very concrete description of the projects concerned and of the reasons you consider them “success stories”. It is essential that the description can easily be

understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.

Maximum length: half a page

Since in 2007 no projects were awarded and the projects funded so far are still in the development stage, it is very difficult for the DA to identify two good practice projects which can be considered success stories.

However, the DA shall identify one project out of the four projects awarded. The project of Fondazzjoni Temi Zammit, is still in its initial stages, nevertheless, it demonstrates to have the potential to be a success story. This assumption is based on the information provided by the applicant organisation and its experience in project management.

The overall objective of the project is to facilitate the integration of third-country nationals of different economic, social, cultural, religious, linguistic and ethnic backgrounds into European societies. The project targets a wide spectrum of the host societies and immigrants themselves with innovative approaches that take into account the principle that integration is a two-way dynamic process of mutual accommodation by both immigrants and citizens of the host society.

The project promotes mutual learning by creating meaningful networks, redefining technological means such as social networking tools into powerful enablers of dialogue and exchange at a local level. This networking element supports an enterprising transnational element, whereby it proposes to establish a network among the participating partners for the exchange of experiences and best practice on specific integration related issues, such as immigrants' access to education and health, with special reference to the needs of youth and women. The network addresses general issues of involvement of the host society and the immigrants' participation in the integration processes and identification of successful and unsuccessful elements. Moreover it addresses issues such as introductory courses, integration tests, declarations and agreements and their impact on the integration of TCNs. It is envisaged that the transnational network will eventually admit other organisations outside the original core group, with a view to stimulate innovation, facilitate exchanges of experience and good practice, and improving the quality of integration policies at the EU level. It is also intended to support transnational awareness-raising campaigns and to promote the use of state-of-the art technologies.

The partners are setting up an e-learning platform and will create specific modules incorporating new methods for language training specially adapted for immigrants from diverse cultural backgrounds, supplemented by courses dealing with practical issues such as legal requirements, schooling, health and institutions.

The DA regards this project as a SMART project.

III.11. Description of one “failure”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009

Among all the projects funded under the programmes from 2007 to 2009, there may be one project which you would regard as an important “failure”, because it proved impracticable, it did not meet expectations, or any other reason for you to judge, and you think there are lessons to be drawn from its failure.

The project should not be identified (i.e. the name of the project or beneficiaries should not be mentioned).

It is essential that the description of the project, your justification for a “failure”, and the lessons to be drawn can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.

Maximum length: half a page

Considering that the awarded projects are still in the development stage it is too early for the DA to identify project(s) which can be considered as “failure” projects.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *The information on technical assistance and on information and publicity available to the Responsible Authority;*
- *Any relevant national document and information available to the Responsible Authority in these matters;*
- *Any independent evaluation of the items addressed below, if available.*

IV.1. Technical assistance

Please provide a concrete description of the activities implemented under the Technical Assistance measures of the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

15 lines maximum

Activities implemented under the Technical Assistance in the period under review consist of events meant to promote the Fund on a national level. These events included cultural activities such as an Arts competition and exhibition focusing on Intercultural Dialogue which was the EU annual priority for 2008. This event was held in Valletta and the exhibition lasted over a number of weeks. The Fund was also promoted during an international event supporting active citizenship of young people with the involvement of TCNs during these events. The activity which lasted one week was held in Valletta in one of the most prominent squares in the capital city; prominence was also given through the national media.

A series of information activities were also organised with the aim to attract the general public. Other information activities were organised to address specific audiences. A promotional activity to provide more visibility to the IFTN was organised to award the successful applicants following the selection results of 2008 and 2009. During this activity high profile organisations were invited to attend.

IV.2. Information and Publicity

Please provide a concrete description of the information and publicity activities (as per Articles 33 and 34 of the EIF Implementing Rules) implemented under the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

Describe separately the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority and those by the final beneficiaries.

As part of the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority, please specify the annual information activity which you have organised to present, as of 2008, the launch of the multiannual programme or the achievements of the annual programme(s), as set out in Article 33 (2) a) of the EIF Implementing Rules.

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority

Between the period 2008 and 2009 a number of information activities have been organised in Malta to promote the EIF. The Maltese context permits the RA to organise various one to one meetings with potential beneficiaries. These one to one meetings as well as other information meetings were mostly held in the premises of the EUPA.

Since other activities implemented by the EUPA manage to attract a wider audience the EUPA has systematically incorporated the EIF in joint information activities with the other programmes to promote the give more visibility to the programme. Consequently both in 2008 and in 2009 the EUPA also organised a series of meetings targeting specific sectors and groups rather than specific programmes.

On a general note during these information activities/meetings the following type of information is normally provided:

- General information about the programme including the MAP and AP;
- General information about the Call for Proposals;
- General Guidelines on the modalities of how to apply, and further clarifications on the various sections of the applications including eligibility rules and funding rules;
- General information on the life-cycle of the projects, selection process and contractual obligations including reporting;
- General information on selection results.

The Selection results are placed on the EUPA's website. Nevertheless, the DA/RA has initiated the process to develop its own website for the Integration fund. The website shall significantly contribute to disseminate information pertaining to the Fund in a more efficient manner providing also the necessary visibility.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

As described in the previous sections the projects awarded by the DA are still in the development phase in this respect it is still too early to comment on the information and publicity activities to be carried out by the beneficiaries.

**Part V: BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF
FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009**

Based on the Commission Decision approving each annual programme and on the information available to the Responsible Authority on the budget implementation of the programmes, please fill in the table below:

Annual Programme	Total EIF contribution to the programme as set in the Commission Decision approving the annual programme Amount (1)	Total EIF contribution <u>committed</u> by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010 Amount (2)	EIF budget implementation rate (EIF Committed/ EIF Available) Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	€14,586.43	€0	0%
Programme 2008	€25,019.70	€9,155.20	19%
Programme 2009	€46,282.79	€82,110.86	70%
TOTAL 2007-2009	€1,588,888.92	€481,266.06	31%

Figures include TA

<p style="text-align: center;">Part VI: ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009</p>
--

Based on:

- *All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each Annual Programme;*
- *Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority.*

Provide your assessment of the implementation of the annual programmes from 2007 through 2009 for the items listed below.

In each case please explain the reasons for your judgement. If for any item you cannot provide an assessment by June 2010, please answer “Not known by June 2010”.

VI.1. Assessment of the implementation of the 2007 Annual Programme

1. Has the 2007 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?

15 lines maximum

The Ministry for Justice and Home Affairs is responsible for the other three strands of the Solidarity funds. Following discussions in October 2007, it was agreed that the Integration Fund was to fall under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. In March 2008, the EUPA was designated as the Delegated Authority for the implementation of the Integration Fund in Malta.

2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2007 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?

15 lines maximum

Due to the fact that management of the EIF was delegated to the EUPA by March 2008, the implementation of the 2007 programme could not be executed as anticipated.

3. Has a revision of the 2007 programme by the Commission been necessary? If so, what were the main changes?

15 lines maximum

Since EUPA became responsible for the Integration Fund only in 2008, a revision of the 2007 programme could not be carried out.

- 4. Have you implemented the 2007 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

15 lines maximum

Not applicable.

- 5. Have the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2007 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - been achieved at the end of this programme?**

15 lines maximum

Not applicable.

- 6. In the light of the implementation of the 2007 programme, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

15 lines maximum

Not applicable.

VI.2. Assessment of the implementation of the 2008 Annual Programme

- 1. Has the 2008 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

15 lines maximum

From the documentation available, the programme in 2008 was not implemented as originally planned and as a result it was not broadly in line with the programme schedule.

2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2008 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?

15 lines maximum

The problems encountered on implementation of the 2008 annual programme related to the delays in initiation of the integration funds due to the unavailability of the actual funds. Other problems concerned the recruitment process of staff to manage the programme.

3. Has a revision of the 2008 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what were/are the main changes?

15 lines maximum

A revision of the 2008 programme has not requested.

- 4. Have you implemented the 2008 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved/to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

15 lines maximum

The implementation of the programme started at a later stage than originally intended. Consequently, the forecasted objectives could not be supported as originally planned.

- 5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2008 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - to be achieved at the end of this programme?**

15 lines maximum

The expected quantitative and qualitative results forecasted for 2008 will be available towards the 3rd quarter of 2010.

- 6. In the light of the implementation of the 2008 programme, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

15 lines maximum

Since only one project was funded in 2008 it is not possible to determine whether the distribution of funding between the Actions was adequate or not.

VI.3. Assessment of the implementation of the 2009 Annual Programme

- 1. Has the 2009 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

15 lines maximum

The revised funding mechanism will reflect the funding mechanism already under implementation by the other 3 strands of the solidarity Funds managed by the Ministry for Justice & Home affairs Malta (MJHA).

2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2009 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?

15 lines maximum

The problems encountered in 2009 include the following aspects:

- A considerable high turnover of staff:

This has disrupted the proper implementation of the programme in 2009. Moreover, this high turnover in such a short period of time hindered the proper assimilation of experience in the field.

- Change in the funding mechanism:

Following discussions in the beginning of 2010 with the Ministry of Finance it was agreed that projects awarded in 2009 should be not be granted a pre-financing payment but on the basis of payment against receipt; (refer to V1.3(1)).

. Has a revision of the 2009 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what are the main changes?

15 lines maximum

It is envisaged that a revision might be required to reflect the new method of funding for the 2009 awarded projects as highlighted above..

- 4. Do you expect to fully implement the 2009 programme (the case being, the revised programme)? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

15 lines maximum

It is too early to determine whether the 2009 programme can be fully implemented.
(Not known by June 2010).

- 5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2009 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission – to be achieved at the end of this programme?**

15 lines maximum

Not known by June 2010- it is too early to determine whether the 2009 programme can be fully implemented.

- 6. In the light of the implementation of the 2009 programme to date, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

15 lines maximum

Further to the implementation of the approved funding mechanism from the EIF for 2009 projects, the EUPA is of the opinion that the funding mechanism insufficiently addresses the national requirements. At present the EUPA is discussing internally more appropriate funding mechanisms for the EIF.

VI.4. The Management and Control System of the EIF programmes and the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007 through 2009

Based on:

- *All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each Annual Programme 2007 through 2009;*
- *The Management and Control system of the EIF in your Member State;*
- *Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority.*

Provide your assessment for the following items. Please explain the reasons for your judgement.

1. Has the Management and Control System of the EIF, which you designed in 2007-8, been efficient for the implementation of the annual programmes so far?

Half a page maximum

The sample available is insufficient to provide reasonable assurance to determine the efficiency for the implementation of the annual programme in so far as the Management and Control Systems of the EIF are concerned.

2. Please list the changes you have made in the Management and Control System of the European Integration Fund which you designed in 2007-8, bearing in mind the experiences gained/ lessons learned during the implementation of the annual programmes 2007 - 2009

Half a page maximum

Not applicable

**Part VII: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE
AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF
PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009**

In case you had recourse to an external expertise for other parts of this report:

This part must always be filled in by the Responsible Authority itself

**VII.1. What is your overall assessment of the EIF implementation in
your Member State from 2007 to 2009?**

1 page maximum

Due to the small size of the country and the complexity of the programme's administrative procedures the implementation of the project was a challenge. However, both the Responsible Authority and the Delegated Authority have and continue to invest in capacity building, training and expertise which should see improved implementation over the current year.

VII.2. On the basis of the information available to you by 30 June 2010, please provide your preliminary assessment in relation to the following aspects of the European Integration Fund in your Member State from 2007 to 2009

* Relevance of the EIF programme's priorities and actions to your national situation

Please describe how relevant the programme's priorities and actions are overall to the problems and needs identified in your Member State. Has there been an evolution in your Member State which required a reshaping of the intervention?

15 lines maximum

The projects awarded so far are still in the initial phase of their implementation as result it is still too early to determine if they have had any significant impact on the national situation. Nevertheless, EIF funds address various issues which are relevant to the National context. The Maltese society is becoming more multinational as people from various nationalities are calling Malta 'home'. Consequently, there has to be more awareness about the 'Common basic principles for immigrant integration policy in the European Union'. These Basic Principles need also to be put into practice.

Research, information, sharing of good practices and exchange of experience also come into play and relevant for the development of policies and practices to facilitate integration on a cross-sectoral national level.

* Effectiveness of the programme

Please highlight the key results of your programme so far and the extent to which the strategy set out in your multiannual programme strategy has been implemented. Are the results of the intervention (as far as they are known by 30 June 2010) consistent with your objectives?

15 lines maximum

Although the RA in Malta has already noted an increase in project proposals, it is still too early to measure the effectiveness of the programme. It is also difficult to analyse whether the awarded projects will have the envisaged impact and results detailed in the proposals.

* Efficiency of the programme

Please estimate the cost of the management of the European Integration Fund so far and whether in your opinion the programme's objectives are being developed in accordance with the original planning at a reasonable cost.

15 lines maximum

The cost of the management of the EIF till the end of 2009 is estimated to be approximately €77,000.00. The RA considers that the expenditure towards the needs to develop the programmes objectives is close to the expenditure to manage other EU funded programmes similar to the EIF. While in the case of the other programmes the target audience is wider in the case of the EIF the target group active in the field is more limited. This limitation is a challenge to the efficiency of the programme.

* Complementarity

Please explain how you ensured complementarity with your nationally funded programmes in the area of intervention of the EIF, on the one hand, and with other EC financial instruments, on the other hand, in particular the European Refugee Fund and the European Social Fund. Did you encounter any difficulty in this respect and, if so, what measures did you take?

15 lines maximum

The European Refugee Fund, The Return Fund and The External Borders Fund, in Malta are managed by the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs, the European Social Fund is managed by the Planning and Priorities Co-ordination Division, within the Office of the Prime Minister. The Integration Fund in Malta is managed by the EUPA. The EUPA is responsible of other programmes which include the Lifelong Learning Programme, the Youth in Action Programme and other educational activities. Complementarity is normally achieved with the other programmes managed by the EUPA.

* Added value

Please explain how you perceive the EIF added value in your Member State in comparison with existing national programmes/policies/budget, and in relation to other EC financial instruments, in the area of intervention of the EIF.

15 lines maximum

The EIF is a programme which addresses a specific field providing funds to influence perception and the development of policy towards TCNs. Funding in Malta specifically towards this aim is limited to the EIF. The added value of the EIF reflects the reality that projects that intend to focus on TCNs may only directly benefit from the opportunities offered by the EIF in Malta.

VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement

In total 2-3 pages maximum

Under this item please specify in particular:

* Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (EIF basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the annual programming exercise in general?

Half a page maximum

Overall the annual programme exercise is satisfactory. Nevertheless, a suggestion to streamline the annual programming exercise could be to have biannual programmes. This would reduce the workload on all the parties involved in the process while committing the RA on a long term strategy.

* Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (EIF basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the implementation of the actions / projects and the control mechanisms on the actions/ projects?

Half a page maximum

The Maltese RA considers that the implementation of the Actions would require more clarity in the execution of the budget as well as a clearer distinction between the Priorities and Specific Priorities. At times the Actions vis a vis the EIF Priorities are too broad and ambiguous to properly put into practice and measure.

* Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in terms of the guidance and support by the Commission to the Member States on the implementation of the programming exercise and the management and control system?

Half a page maximum

In our opinion the support and guidance provided by the EC is very good. The EC has been very supportive and assistance has always been very rapid. Moreover, The EC has also been very sensitive by keeping in mind the local realities.

End of the report